

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 10-14 are amended to even further distinguish over the applied references. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 10-14 can be found, for example, on page 11, line 19 to page 12, line 1 of the specification. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Miyatake et al. (Miyatake), U.S. Patent No. 6,750,903, in view of Shimizu, U.S. Patent No. 7,064,780, and further in view of Chen, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0010546 A1. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Miyatake, Shimizu and Chen does not disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, an electronic camera having a multi-shooting mode in which data of a composite image is generated by arranging and compositing data of a predetermined number of frame images generated by continuous shooting... the predetermined number of frame images is a fixed number that is determined in advance and that is necessary for generating the composite image arranged in a matrix form, as recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 5- 7 and similarly recited in the methods of claims 10-14.

Miyatake discloses the feature of combining a plurality of images with different zoom rates to generate super high resolution images. However, as acknowledged by the Office Action, Miyatake does not disclose generating a composite image arranged in a matrix form. Further, the disclosure of Miyatake is based on the assumption that determination of the zoom rate and overwriting of the images are performed on each and every frame of the moving image based on a comparison between the feature quantities of previous and next adjacent (in time) images. Also, Miyatake does not disclose extracting a fixed predetermined number of

images determined in advance necessary for generating a composite image arranged in a matrix form from a plurality of images obtained by continuous shooting.

Shimizu fails to overcome the deficiencies of Miyatake. Specifically, although Shimizu discloses displaying a multi-picture image of pictures obtained during continuous shooting, Shimizu does not disclose extracting a fixed predetermined number of images determined in advance necessary for generating a composite image arranged in a matrix form from a plurality of images obtained by continuous shooting.


Similarly, Chen fails to overcome the deficiencies of Miyatake and Shimizu. Chen discloses a "planar composite image," which is a plurality of images planarly placed and combined (see paragraphs [0038]-[0040]). However, Chen performs the shootings of the images only the number of times necessary to generate the "planar composite image," and does not disclose extracting a fixed predetermined number of images determined in advance necessary for generating a composite image arranged in a matrix form from a plurality of images obtained by continuous shooting.

Therefore, the combination of Miyatake, Shimizu and Chen does not disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, an electronic camera having a multi-shooting mode in which data of a composite image is generated by arranging and compositing data of a predetermined number of frame images generated by continuous shooting... the predetermined number of frame images is a fixed number that is determined in advance and that is necessary for generating the composite image arranged in a matrix form, as recited in independent claims 1, 3 and 5-7 and similarly recited in the methods of claims 10-14. Therefore, independent claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 10-14 and dependent claims 2, 4, 8, 9 and 15-24 are patentable over the combination of Miyatake, Shimizu and Chen. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,365

Justin T. Lingard  
Registration No. 61,276

MAC:JTL/emd

Date: May 11, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--